



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,804	06/12/2001	Chiaki Imaeda	9319S-000223	3726
27572	7590	12/16/2003	EXAMINER	
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			CHUNG, DAVID Y	
P.O. BOX 828			ART UNIT	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			PAPER NUMBER	
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,804	IMAEDA, CHIAKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Y. Chung	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3, 7, 10, 17, 20-29, 33-40, 42, 43, 51-55, 57 and 58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 41, 44-46 and 56 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 8, 11-15, 18, 19, 30-32, 47, 49, 50 and 59-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 6, 9, 16 and 48 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the response to restriction requirement filed on September 10, 2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that an undue burden is not placed on the examiner. This is not found persuasive because of the different classification of the subcombinations identified by the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 15, 19, 30, 31, 47, 49, 50, and 61 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshii et al. (U.S. 6,147,724).

As to claims 1, 30, 47, 49 and 50, Yoshii discloses a liquid crystal display module in figure 4A comprising a liquid crystal display panel and a backlighting unit. Note the panel substrate SUB1, drain driver chip IC1, and the drain spacer DSPC which covers the drain driver chip and has a notch structure NOT at a location corresponding to the drain driver chip. The drain spacer DSPC functions as a holding member and the notch structure NOT functions as a storing portion. See column 12, lines 51-58. The notch structure contains a recess for storing the drain driver chip IC1.

As to claims 15, 19 and 31, the drain spacer DSPC abuts against the panel substrate SUB1 and the notch structure functions as the storing portion for storing the drain driver chip IC1.

As to claim 61, the drain driver chip IC1 and gate driver chip IC2 are the control means for controlling the liquid crystal device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4, 5, 8, 11-14, 18, 32, 59, 60 and 62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshii et al. (U.S. 6,147,724).

As to claims 4, 5, 32, and 59, Yoshii et al. does not disclose a protective material formed on the surface of panel substrate SUB1. However, it was well known to cover the panel substrate with a protective material in order to protect the gate and drain driver chips from mechanical shock and electrical failure. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to cover the panel substrate with a protective material in order to protect the driving chips from electrical failure and mechanical shock.

As to claims 8 and 11-14, Yoshii et al. does not disclose a plurality of drain driver chips mounted to the panel substrate and held by a notch structure. However, it was well known to provide multiple drain driver chips because this was a much more feasible way of driving a large display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide multiple drain driver chips because it was a more feasible way of driving a large display. It would have been obvious to provide corresponding notch structures in order to individually protect each drain driver chip.

As to claim 18, Yoshii et al. does not disclose an elastic holding portion for holding the panel substrate in a state abutted against the abutting portion. However, it was well known to do this in order to reduce the amount of

mechanical stress on the panel substrate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide an elastic holding portion in order to reduce the amount of mechanical stress on the panel substrate.

As to claim 60, the liquid crystal display panel shown in figure 4A is manufactured by disposing liquid crystal material between substrates SUB1 and SUB2.

As to claim 62, the drain driver chip IC1 and gate driver chip IC2 are the control means for controlling the liquid crystal device.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 41, 44-46 and 56 allowed.

Claims 2, 6, 9, 16 and 48 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art did not teach or suggest a holding member disposed along an electro-optical panel so as to cover the electro-optical panel and having a storing portion for storing an electronic part mounted to the electro-optical panel, wherein the holding member is configured to function as a light guide.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-0155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Parker', is written above the printed name.

**KENNETH PARKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER**